

**REMARKS**

Claims 49-67 were presented for review. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 50-52 and 58-62 recite allowable subject matter. By this amendment, claims 49 and 57 have been canceled, leaving claims 50-56 and 58-62 pending. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, the Office action objects to the drawings. More specifically, the Office action asserts that Figs. 1 and 2 are inconsistent and fail to properly reflect the claimed subject matter. In response, a replacement drawing sheet is submitted herewith incorporating changes to Fig. 2 as suggested by the Office action. In particular, corrected Fig. 2 now more clearly shows a space between the bearing assembly 20 and the motor (identified in the Office action as the "handle shaped object"), which is consistent with Fig. 1. In addition, Fig. 2 now shows the "triangular shaped area" of the first bore 65. Still further, the spacer 25 of amended Fig. 2 is more consistent sized with the representation of the spacer 25 shown in original Fig. 1. Finally, Fig. 2 has been re-oriented to be vertically aligned and the motor includes the "feathering", as suggested in the Office action.

Due to the nature of the changes to Fig. 2, Applicant has not submitted a marked-up copy of the amendments. It is Applicant's understanding that such a marked-up copy is permissible, but not required, under 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d)(2) does not appear to apply, since the Office action does not require a marked-up copy but instead indicates that a "proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action" (emphasis added). Applicant has elected to submit a corrected drawing, with sufficient explanation of the changes to the drawing, and therefore is in compliance with the statute and the requirements of the Office action. Consideration and approval of amended Fig. 2 are respectfully requested.

Turning to the rejection on the art, Applicant submits that the amendment to the claims obviates the prior art rejection. More specifically, the Office action indicates that claims 50-52 and 58-67 are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, claims 49 and 57 have been canceled and claims 50, 51, 52, 58, 60, and 61 have been rewritten in independent form. Thus, all claims now pending in the application are allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 50-56 and 58-67 are in good and proper form for allowance. A favorable action on the part of the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

By:

  
Brent E. Matthias  
Reg. No. 41,974  
Attorneys for Applicants  
6300 Sears Tower  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6300

May 25, 2004